

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments

Claims 1, 5, 6, 15, 18, 23, 28, 35, 39, 40, 46, 50, and 55 are modified in this amendment. No claims have been cancelled and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-57 remain present for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application for at least the reasons presented below.

Specification

The Office Action objected to claims 5 and 6 for various informalities. Specifically, the Office Action states that "Applicants are required to spell out the term LDAP in claim 5 and SQL in claim 6." The requested amendments to claims 5 and 6 have been made herein. Additionally, similar amendments have been made to the Abstract and Specification.

In addition, the Office Action objected to the title as not being descriptive of the invention. The Applicant respectfully contends that the title "Support for Multiple Data Stores" is in fact "clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed" and no less descriptive than the titles of the references cited in the Office Action. Furthermore, the Applicant suggests that the title, especially when considered in light of the claims and abstract, is sufficient to allow classification, indexing, and searching. However, if the Examiner has a suggestion for a more descriptive title, the Applicant will carefully consider such an amendment.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection, Hassett et al.

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-4 and 7-57 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,311 of Hassett et al. (hereinafter "Hassett"). The Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments pointing out significant differences between claims 1-4 and 7-57 submitted by the Applicant and Hassett.

Hassett is directed to "servicing of client requests on a network." (Col. 1, lines 15-16) Under Hassett, "HTTP GET requests from client computers are served by assigned agents on the caching proxy server." (Col. 7, lines 13-15) "When a GET request is received by the caching proxy server, the category id of the request is examined to determine which agent on the caching proxy server should serve the request." (Col. 7, line 29-32) That is, under Hassett, the agent used to process a request is determined by information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, from the client. (See also FIG. 5A) The category ID from the request is based on the last information sent to the client. (Col. 5, lines 35-36, col. 9, lines 9-33, col. 19, line 10 - col. 22, line 35)

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-4 and 7-17 depend, relate to a method of supporting multiple data stores for an integrated access system and identity system. Claim 35, upon which claims 36-39 depend, relates to one or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method. Both claim 1 and claim 35 recite in part "receiving a request at said integrated access system and identity system, said integrated access system and identity system supporting a plurality of data stores, each data store associated with an agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store; accessing based on the profiles one or more of said data stores via the agent for the one or more data stores in response to said request." Hassett does not relate to, or even mention, an integrated access system and identity system. Further, Hassett does not teach a plurality of data stores, each data store associated with an agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store and accessing, based on the profiles, one or more of said data stores via the agent. Rather, Hassett teaches determining an agent to process a request based on information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, the information in the request based on the last information sent to the client. For at least these reasons, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 1-4, 7-17, and 35-39 allowed.

Claim 18, upon which claims 19-27 depend, relates to a method of supporting multiple data stores. Claim 40, upon which claims 41-45 depend, relates to one or more

processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method. Both claim 18 and claim 40 recite in part "receiving a request to access one or more of a plurality of data stores, each data store having a profile representing configuration information for the data store; determining based on the profiles which data stores can service said request, each data store is associated with a separate agent; accessing said data stores that can service said request by communicating with said associated agents." Hassett does not teach each data store having a profile representing configuration information for the data store and determining based on the profiles which data stores can service a request. Rather, Hassett teaches determining an agent to process a based on information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, the information in the request based on the last information sent to the client. For at least these reasons, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 18-27 and 40-45 allowed.

Claim 28, upon which claims 29-34 depend, relates to a method of supporting multiple data stores. Claim 46, upon which claims 47-49 depend, relates to one or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method. Claim 50, upon which claims 51-54 depend, relates to an apparatus that supports multiple data stores. Claims 28, 46, and 50 recite in part "receiving a request to access one or more of a plurality of data stores, each data store having and a profile representing configuration information for the data store; determining based on the profiles which data stores can service said request; creating a proxy having knowledge of which data stores can service said request; using said proxy to access said data stores that can service said request." Hassett does not teach each data store having and a profile representing configuration information for the data store and determining based on the profiles which data stores can service a request. Rather, Hassett teaches determining an agent to process a based on information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, the information in the request based on the last information sent to the client. Furthermore, Hassett does not teach creating a proxy having knowledge of which data stores can

service a request. For at least these reasons, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 28-34 and 46-54 allowed.

Claim 55, upon which claims 56 and 57 depend, relates to a system that supports multiple data stores. Claim 55 recites in part "a set of profiles, each profile associated with one of said data stores; a set of agents, each agent associated with one of said data stores; a temporary proxy; and a database manager, said database manager in communication with said profiles, said database manager creates said proxy in response to a request to access said data stores, said database manager caused said proxy to be in communication with agents associated with data stores that can service said request based on the profiles." Hassett does not teach a set of profiles, each profile associated with one of said data stores and a database manager causing a proxy to be in communication with agents associated with data stores that can service a request based on the profiles. Rather, Hassett teaches determining an agent to process a based on information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, the information in the request based on the last information sent to the client. Furthermore, Hassett does not teach a temporary proxy created by a database manager in response to a request to access the data stores. For at least these reasons, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 55-57 allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Hassett in view of Brown et al.

The Office Action has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited portions of Hassett in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,733 of Brown et al. (hereinafter "Brown"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must establish: 1) some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or combine their teachings; 2) a reasonable expectation of success of such a modification or

combination; and 3) a teaching or suggestion in the cited prior art of each claimed limitation. See MPEP §706.02(j).

As will be discussed below, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest each claimed limitation. The Office Action does not provide evidence that the suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references cited is explicit or implicit in the references cited. Further, the Office Action does not provide any evidence that knowledge of one skilled in the art would provide the suggestion or motivation to modify these references. Finally, the Office Action does not provide evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of such a modification or combination.

As discussed in detail above, claim 1, upon which claims 5 and 6 depend, is distinguishable from Hassett since Hassett does not teach or suggest a plurality of data stores, each data store associated with an agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store; accessing based on the profiles one or more of said data stores via the agent.

Brown is directed to " a method and system that authenticates users and authorizes the users to access a walled garden of network services." (Col. 2, lines 15-17) Under Brown " When a user wishes to access a service in the walled garden, the client sends a hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) request to the WGPS identifying the plot number of the requested service. If the client has a ticket granting access to the walled garden, the client includes the ticket in an authorization header." (Col. 2, line 66 - col. 3, line 4) " In response to a denial, the client sends a message to the GS requesting a ticket. The user authenticates himself or herself to the client by providing authentication information and the client provides this information to the GS." (Col. 3, lines 7-10) That is, Brown provides access to controlled resources based on a ticket or key provided by a client. However, Brown does not teach or suggest a plurality of data stores, each data store associated with an agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store; accessing based on the profiles one or more of said data stores via the agent.

The combination of Hassett and Brown is no more revelant to the pending claims than either reference alone. Neither Hassett nor Brown, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a plurality of data stores, each data store associated with an agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store; accessing based on the profiles one or more of said data stores via the agent. Therefore, the references cited in the Office Action fail to teach or suggest each claimed limitation. Additionally, neither reference suggests such a modification. The Office Action does not provide evidence that the suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references cited is explicit or implicit in the references cited. Further, the Office Action does not provide any evidence that knowledge of one skilled in the art would provide the suggestion or motivation to modify or combine these references. Finally, the Office Action does not provide evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of such a modification or combination. Therefore claims 5 and 6 should be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

Date: May 25, 2005

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver)
WJD/sbm
60493203 v1